

6112411, 8901042

(E2)
This document contains information
Number 1 of 100 copies, Series 2

(STATE DRAFT. Not cleared with Department of Defense)

SUBSTANCE OF DISCUSSIONS

OF

STATE-JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF MEETING
HELD IN ROOM 2C923, THE PENTAGON BUILDING
ON WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 14, 1959, AT 11:00 A.M.

EXCISE

PRIMAT

Defense

General Twining, USAF
General Taylor, USA
Admiral Burke, USN
General White, USAF
General Pate, USMC
Lt. General Picher, USAF
Lt. General Moore, USA
Vice Admiral Dennison, USN
Lt. General Gerhart, USAF
Major General Roberts, USMC
Brig. General Hillyard, USA
Captain Cobb, USN
Rear Admiral Wellings, USN
Major General Terrill, USAF
Rear Admiral Dudley, USN
Major General Johnson, USA
Brig. General Fields, USMC
Brig. General Whisenand, USAF

State

Mr. Robert Murphy
Mr. Frederick Melanardt
Mr. Foy Kohler
Mr. Albert Mathews
Mr. Martin Hillenbrand
Mr. Robert Kearney
Mr. Dwight Porter

ISA

Mr. Robert Knight

RECEIVED 1/20/59

✓ *McLusker* 6/20/91
✓ *McLusker* 3/1/59
✓ *McLusker* 3/1/59
✓ *McLusker* 3/1/59

1. Berlin
2. C-130 Case
3. DeGaulle Proposals for Tripartite Action

1. Berlin

Mr. Murphy opened the meeting by referring to the tripartite talks which had been held with the British and French on the question of Paragraph D of the paper on Berlin contingency planning. He quoted Paragraph D of the U.S. aide-memoire of December 11, 1958, as follows:

V

B1

He mentioned that Mr. Irwin and General Johnson had been participating in the talks and that he assumed the JCS was currently informed.

Mr. Murphy discussed the British position [

B1

[The U.S. position is that the principle should be decided upon and agreed by the three powers before detailed military planning is entered into. [

B1

[He said that the purpose of the meeting was to arrive at a coordinated U.S. point of view and to assure that the military judgment of the JCS was in consonance with the political judgment of the Department on this matter.

General Twining indicated that the Joint Chiefs had approved on January 13 a planning paper on the military preparations for action in the Berlin situation as required by Paragraph D. The paper is now

before the Secretary of Defense, who has expressed his desire to give it further consideration and perhaps to make some amendments but it represents the basic JCS thinking on the matter. The paper is for U.S. use only (copies of the draft JCS paper were provided to Mr. Murphy for the Department's study and information on the understanding that it would not be considered a final document until cleared by the Secretary of Defense). General Twining went on to describe the paper as the Joint Chiefs idea of all the steps that must be taken to prepare for possible action in the Berlin situation. He felt that it was important the Department understand what the military requirements of the situation are.

General White then intervened to inquire if the Department had taken a firm political decision to press for the action envisioned in Paragraph D. Mr. Murphy replied that the decision was taken in principle by the Department to take all possible measures to secure our right of land access to Berlin [

B1

[In response to a further question from General White asking clarification of our policy, Mr. Murphy stated specifically that the Department was supporting the language of Paragraph D. Paragraph D must, of course, be considered in the context of the entire paper on contingency planning, including the later section which discussed the

[

] He then quoted the last paragraph, Section ...

B1

as follows:

[

DECLASSIFIED

B1

He pointed out that we were not excluding [] or indeed any other possibility but that we felt that the psychological effect of the action proposed under Section D was essential. B1

Admiral Burke indicated his full concurrence with the Department's position. He pointed out that the decision involved not only [] but the taking of many preparatory steps ahead of the time of action. If we sent an armed force into East Germany, we must be prepared to follow through. [] B1

[] General White then asked again if the State Department was prepared to support the statement in Paragraph D. Mr. Murphy answered yes but pointed out the purpose of the meeting was to be sure that "he whose ox may be gored" is also in agreement.

There was a general discussion of the JCS paper in which it was pointed out that the planners had attempted to take every possibility into consideration. General Twining pointed out that the concept was summarized in Appendix B of the paper and that this was the most sensitive part. Mr. Murphy asked if a part of the proposal involved notifying the USSR in advance of our intentions. General Taylor responded that such notification was implicit but that the JCS paper represented a "military scenario" and that a "political scenario" was needed as a companion piece. Mr. Murphy responded that we had recently been encouraged by evidence that the Russians desire to negotiate and that this would indicate the desirability of signalling our intentions in advance.

Mr. Murphy then asked if his assumption is correct that the JCS did not wish at this point to engage in joint military planning with the British and French. The consensus of response appeared to be that detailed planning should be conducted in Europe instead of the U.S. and that General Norstad should be in overall charge. In response to Mr. Murphy's question General Taylor indicated that General Norstad's views had already been requested and would be incorporated in the final revision of plans which would be transmitted to Norstad after approval at the governmental level.

Mr. Murphy then commented on the French point of view. [

] Ambassador Alphand attempted to provide new language for Paragraph D which would bridge the gap between U.S. and UK thinking but without success. Mr. Murphy pointed out that recent reports from Paris indicate that General DeGaulle has been highly critical of U.S. policies and actions except as regards Berlin but this support of our firm stand in Berlin does not appear to be reflected in Ambassador Alphand's attitude here.

With regard to the British position, Ambassador Caccia has rigid instructions. Ambassador Whitney has recently reported the softness in the British attitude which he thinks may stem from the influence of

B1

Lord Mountbatten, who has been reported as saying that Britain cannot afford the risk of annihilation over the Berlin issue. Admiral Burke suggested that he might write Mountbatten on the matter and Mr. Murphy agreed it would be useful if Admiral Burke could point out the U.S. view that if every test of strength the Russians is viewed in terms of the risk of total destruction, there can be no agreement on a firm response in any situation.

Mr. Murphy then discussed the West German attitude and indicated that this must be explored further. One of the problems is Adenauer's detachment as a result of his illness last month. He has just sent Herr Dittman of the Foreign Office to the U.S. to discuss matters with the Department and we are in active consultation with Ambassador Grewe to whom we have put several leading questions designed to stimulate German thinking on possible solutions to the Berlin and German problems. We do not yet know the German reaction on such questions as those posed by the proposals for the U.S. response to closure of ground access to Berlin. How far would West Germany like to see us go in our response to the closing off of access to Berlin. The German attitude has been that the U.S. should stand firm. The question is what will they do in support of such a stand and what risks will they be willing to take. Will they furnish West German troops if this is considered desirable.

General Twining asked if there were any State Department objections to placing General Norstad in charge. Mr. Murphy asked if Norstad's role involved both planning and command of actual operations. He indicated that he could not respond to the question without further study since larger issues were involved but that his initial reaction was that there were no other operational commanders who could be assigned to the job. General Taylor indicated that General Hodges (USAREUR) could be given command but that in principle it should be Norstad. It was agreed that the Department would express its views on this matter. Mr. Reinhardt added that the lack of enthusiasm in NATO would create a lot of problems.

SECRET

and Mr. Murphy added that it might be best to have planning conducted on a strictly U.S. basis under Norstad's direction as CINCEUR.

General Twining commented on the conversation with the President on January 13 at which the President had expressed [

[The President mentioned that General Clay was not fully satisfied with the arrangements he was able to make on this matter while in Berlin. Mr. Murphy referred to the Department's recent publication on this point which makes a good case. He pointed out that our legal rights are based not only on the Clay-Zhukov talks but on the European Advisory Commission agreements in London in 1944 and on the Paris communique of 1949 following the end of the Berlin airlift. He added that our primary rights are those of conquest and ^{stem as well from} / the quid pro quo established by U.S. withdrawal from ^{area which} the/ became the Soviet zone in exchange for our position in Berlin.

General Twining requested the Department's views on how we should react [

B1

B1

II

CLASSIFIED

B1

General Taylor then stressed the necessity for "domestic education" to prepare the American public for our proposed Berlin plans. Mr. Murphy felt that there has been to date a good emotional reaction in the U.S. as evidenced by the bi-partisan applause in Congress at the mention of Berlin in the State of the Union message. He agreed, however, that the actual issues have not been explained so that there would be clear public understanding and that further education will indeed be necessary. General Twining commented that it would be more difficult if we "go it alone" without support of our allies. Mr. Murphy agreed and pointed out that this was what was so disappointing about the British attitude. He felt that the President would have to intercede with Prime Minister Macmillan if we are unable to make progress at the lower levels. Reference was made to Prime Minister Macmillan's recent letter to Secretary Dulles on this subject and to the Secretary's response which was planned for despatch today.

Mr. Murphy indicated in response to General Twining's question that the Mikoyan discussion with the Secretary on Friday will bear heavily on the problem of Berlin. Mr. Murphy pointed out that Secretary Dulles feels strongly that we must be prepared to meet the Russian challenge.

The discussion on Berlin closed with a strong expression of the JCS view by General Twining that an airlift will not settle the Berlin issue and should be avoided if at all possible.

2. C-130 Incident

[

NR